

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION

JOEY L. CROFT,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
VS.	§ (CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:06-1684-HFF-WMC
	§	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,	§	
Commissioner of Social Security,	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This is a Social Security case in which Plaintiff seeks judicial review of the final decision of Defendant denying his claim for disability insurance benefits. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the decision of Defendant be reversed under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g), with a remand of the cause to Defendant for further proceedings. The Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

6:06-cv-01684-HFF Date Filed 05/21/07 Entry Number 16 Page 2 of 2

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on May 1, 2007. The parties failed to file any

objections to the Report. In the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any

explanation for adopting the recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th

Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standards

set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment

of this Court that the decision of Defendant be REVERSED under sentence four of 41 U.S.C.

§405(g), with a **REMAND** of the cause to Defendant for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 21st day of May, 2007, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd

HENRY F. FLOYD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2